

103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulon et al. (5,712,760) in view of Kamikakai et al. (6,154,359). Applicant has reviewed Coulon et al. in view of Kamikakai et al., and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19 are not obvious in view of Coulon et al. and Kamikakai et al., taken alone or in combination.

Claims 1 and 10

Applicant respectfully states that the Independent Claims 1 and 10 include the limitation "an attachable numeric input pad." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places including page 28 lines 6-16. This limitation is not taught or rendered obvious over Coulon et al. in view of Kamikakai et al.

The rejection states that Coulon et al. teaches an attachable numeric keypad, and cites that Fig. 3a reference character 326 shows keys that are clearly the numeric keypad keys of a standard keyboard. Applicant agrees that Coulon et al. purports to show a numeric keypad of keys of a standard keyboard, however, Applicant disagrees that the numeric keypad of Coulon et al. is an attachable numeric input pad which may be optionally coupled with the segmented keyboard.

In addition, the specification of the instant application teaches that the attachable numeric keypad may be optionally coupled with the segmented keyboard on either the left or right side. Applicant understands Coulon et al.

only to recite the use of a numeric keypad in an fixed standard sided configuration. In fact, Applicant understands Coulon et al. to teach away from the use of any type of removable configuration as claimed. Instead, Applicant understands Coulon et al. to teach a segmented keyboard which is fixedly attached.

The teachings of Kamikakai et al. alone or in combination with Coulon et al. fails to render obvious the claimed invention because Kamikakai et al. does not remedy the defects of Coulon et al. as discussed above. Applicant understands Kamikakai et al., to teach nothing of an attachable numeric input pad. In addition, Applicant understands Kamikakai et al. to teach nothing about a segmented keyboard. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that neither Coulon et al. nor Kamikakai et al. teaches or render obvious the limitations of Claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully states the combination of Coulon et al. and Kamikakai et al. fails to teach or render obvious the limitations of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 2 and 11

With reference now to Claims 2 and 11, Applicant respectfully states that neither Coulon et al. nor Kamikakai et al. alone or in combination teach or make obvious the limitation of "an electrical connector adapted to couple the segmented keyboard with a portable computing system." The rejection states that Coulon et al. teaches that the electrical connector is adapted to couple the segmented keyboard with a portable computing system (col. 6, lines 9-12). However, Applicant understands Coulon et al. to teach that the second hinge is integrally formed with the housing (col. 6, lines 3-5; col. 5, lines 25-30; col. 4, lines 31-35, etc.). That is, Applicant understands the

segmented keyboard of Coulon et al. to be fixedly coupled with the portable-computing screen.

Applicant respectfully states that the electrical connector of Claims 2 and 11 couples the segmented keyboard with a portable computing system, and therefore as described in the specification, the segmented keyboard may be decoupled from the portably computing system. This claimed limitation is not taught or rendered obvious by Coulon et al. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Coulon et al. does not teach nor render obvious the embodiments of Claims 2 and 11.

Claims 3-8 and Claims 12-17

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Claims 2 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 3-8 are dependent on Independent Claim 1 and Claims 12-17 are dependent on Independent Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 3-8 and Claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Claim 19

With respect to Claim 19, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Coulon et al. fails to teach of the second rotatable hinge to provide an optimum view angle positioning of the display panel of the portable computing system relative to an individual user. However, Applicant disagrees that Kamikakai et al. teaches such a limitation. Specifically, Applicant understands Kamikakai et al. to teach nothing about a portable computing system coupled with a segmented keyboard. Rather, Applicant understands Kamikakai et al. to teach a hinge apparatus for a portable computing system having a solid keyboard as the lower portion of a two portion apparatus.

In addition, Applicant believes the act of applying the rotatable hinge design of Kamikakai et al. to a segmented keyboard would require extensive modification due to the structural differences (size, weight, etc.) of the materials used by the Kamikakai et al. teachings in contrast to a segmented foldable keyboard of the instant application. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to realize the claimed embodiment in view of the cited combination because of these differences. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the combination of Kamikakai et al. with Coulon et al. fails to teach or render obvious the present invention. Furthermore, due to the possible structural incongruities (e.g., the weight difference between the keyboard systems) the comparison of Kamikakai et al. with the instant application is not obvious and may not even be possible, as the keyboard system of the instant application is completely incongruent with that of Kamikakai et al.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Independent Claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 9, 18 and 20

Claims 9, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulon et al. over Kamikakai et al. as applied to Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19 above, and further in view of Wahl et al. (6,101,676). Applicant has reviewed Coulon et al. in view of Kamikakai et al., and further in view of Wahl et al., and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 9, 18 and 20 are not obvious in view of Coulon et al., Kamikakai et al., and Wahl et al., alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19 above as being unpatentable over Coulon et al. in view of Kamikakai et al. has been overcome, and that Independent Claims 1, 10 and 19 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 9 is dependent on Independent Claim 1, Claim 18 is dependent on Independent Claim 10, and Claim 20 is dependent on Independent Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 9, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Date: 10/7/2003

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060